REMARKS

Applicant would like to express appreciation to the Examiner for the detailed Final Official Action provided. Upon entry of the present amendment, claim 1 will have been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 8, and claim 8 will have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1-6 remain pending in the present application.

The Examiner has made a non-statutory double-patenting rejection of all pending claims (*i.e.*, claims 1-6 and 8) in view of claims 1-11 of parent U.S. Patent No. 6,714,235 for the same reasons set forth in the previous Official Action of June 13, 2005. Together with the present response, Applicant has submitted a duly executed Terminal Disclaimer, which overcomes the obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Applicant is filing the enclosed terminal disclaimer merely to remove any issue as to whether the claims of the above-identified application and those of U.S. Patent No. 6,714,235 in any way conflict. However, neither Applicant nor the Assignee intends to make any representation as to whether the invention defined by any of the claims of either the application or the patent would have been obvious in view of the other, or whether an obviousness-type double patenting rejection would be appropriate if the enclosed terminal disclaimer was not filed. Nor does Applicant acquiesce in the propriety of the Examiner's rejection. The terminal disclaimer is being filed only to expedite the allowance of the pending claims. It is thus respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the double – patenting rejection.

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,243,416 to NAKAZAWA in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,877,802 to

TAKAHASHI et al. for the same reasons set forth in the previous Official Action of June 13, 2005. Specifically, regarding claim 1, the Examiner has found that NAKAZAWA discloses the invention according to claim 1 except for the details of the switching operation. However, the Examiner has found that TAKAHASHI discloses this feature, and concludes that it would have been obvious to include this feature into the invention of NAKAZAWA.

Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejection, and submits that the applied references are markedly different from the present invention as claimed. Applicant further expressly incorporates herein all arguments made in Applicant's previous Amendment and Response of September 12, 2005. As discussed *supra*, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to incorporate the limitations of claim 8 (which has not been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103), which should not be taken as an acquiescence by Applicant as to the propriety of the rejection. Further, Applicant expressly reserves the right to submit claims of a related scope in another application. Thus, the cancellation of the claim in the present application is without prejudice.

Specifically, any proper combination of NAKAZAWA and TAKAHASHI does not disclose at least the claimed switching processor that completes synchronization of the synchronizing signals before said video signal switching processor outputs the video signals to said peripheral device, and the claimed switching control processor that drives a video signal switching processor and a synchronizing signal switching processor, and suspends output of video signals for a predetermined period while the switched synchronizing signals are output, the predetermined period being longer than the time required for the synchronizing signal to synchronize with a peripheral device.

Further, Applicant asserts that the amendment to the claims does not raise new issues that require the Examiner to conduct an additional search. Specifically, the limitations of dependent claim 8 (which have already been searched) have been incorporated into independent claim 1 (which has already been searched), claim 8 (now cancelled) having previously been directly dependent from claim 1.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as well as each and every pending claim of the present application, meets the requirements for patentability under at least 35 U.S.C. § 103, and respectfully requests the Examiner to indicate the allowance of each and every pending claim in the present application.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In view of the fact that none of the art of record, whether considered alone, or in any proper combination thereof, discloses or suggests the present invention, reconsideration of the Examiner's action and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested and are believed to be appropriate.

Applicant notes that this amendment is being made to advance prosecution of the application to allowance, and with respect to the features of claim 8 incorporated into claim 1, should not be considered as surrendering equivalents of the territory between this claim prior to the present amendment and the amended claim. Further, no acquiescence as to the propriety of the Examiner's rejection is made by the present amendment. All other amendments to the claims which have been made in this amendment, and which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

Should the Examiner have any questions or comments regarding this Response, or the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,
Hideo SUGIMOTO

William S. Boshnick
Reg. No. 44,550

Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027

February 24, 2006
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191